

ORIGINAL

ORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

	4				
2	COMMISSIONERS	RECEIVED			
3	SUSAN BITTER SMITH - Chairman BOB STUMP	2015 MAR 30 A 9 52			
4	BOB BURNS	AZ CORP COMMISSION			
5	DOUG LITTLE TOM FORESE	DOCKET CONTROL			
6					
7	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF	DOCKET NO. W-03515A-14-0310			
8	TONTO BASIN WATER CO., INC. FOR APPROVAL OF AN ADJUSTMENT IN THE EXISTING RATES CHARGED BY THE	NOTICE OF FILING STAFF'S DIRECT TESTIMONY			
9	COMPANY.	STAFF S DIRECT TESTIMONT			
10					
l 1	Staff of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Staff") hereby files the Direct Testimony of				
12	L. John Lesueur, in the above-captioned docket.				
13	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 30 th day of March, 2015.				
14	2 / / /				
15					
16					
17					
18		Phoenix, Arizona 85007 602) 542-3402			
19	Original and thirteen (13) copies of the				
20	foregoing filed this 30th day of March, 2015, with:				
21	Docket Control Arizona Corporation Commission	Arizona Corporation Commission			
22	1200 West Washington Street	DOCKETED			
23	Phoenix, AZ 85007	MAR 3 0 2015			
24	Copy of the foregoing emailed/mailed	DOCKETED BY 70			
25	this 30 th day of March, 2015, to:				
26	Jason Williamson JW Water Holdings, LLC				
27	Post Office Box 200595 Denver, CO 80220				
<i>4</i>	iw@iwwyster.net				

1	Jay L. Shapiro Shapiro Law Firm, P.C.		
2	1819 E. Morten Avenue, Suite 280		
3	Phoenix, AZ 85020 jay@shapslawaz.com		
4	Gary and Margaret Lantagne Tonto Creek Trail RV Park, Inc.		
5	Post Office Box 669 Tonto Basin, AZ 85553		
6	cmgeor@hotmail.com		
7	Robert T. Hardcastle Brooke Utilities, Inc.		
8	Post Office Box 82218 Bakersfield, CA 93380		
9	RTH@brookeutilities.com		
10			
11	Monica a Mant		
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20	·		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

SUSAN BITTER SMITH	
Chairman	
BOB STUMP	
Commissioner	
BOB BURNS	
Commissioner	
DOUG LITTLE	
Commissioner	
TOM FORESE	
Commissioner	
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF	DOCKET NO. W-03515A-14-0310
TONTO BASIN WATER CO., INC., AN	
ARIZONA CORPORATION, FOR A)
DETERMINATION OF THE FAIR VALUE OF)
ITS UTILITY PLANTS AND PROPERTY AND	
FOR INCREASES IN ITS WATER RATES AND	
CHARGES FOR UTILITY SERVICE BASED	ı
THEREON.	1

DIRECT

TESTIMONY

OF

L. JOHN LESUEUR

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

UTILITIES DIVISION

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	SETTLEMENT PROCESS	2
III.	AGREEMENT	3

I. INTRODUCTION

- Q. Please state your name, occupation, and business address.
- A. My name is John LeSueur. I am employed by the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") as an Assistant Director in the Utilities Division ("Staff"). My business address is 1200 West Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85007.

Q. Please state your educational background.

A. I graduated from the University of Texas School of Law in 2003 with a Juris Doctorate and from Brigham Young University in 2000 with a Bachelor's Degree in Economics.

Q. Please describe your professional work experience.

- A. I am a member of the Arizona State Bar. From September 2003 through November 2006, I worked as an environment and natural resources attorney for Fennemore Craig. I worked on cases involving the Federal Clean Water Act, the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act, and Arizona's Underground Storage Tank Assurance Fund.
 - From January 2007 thru December 2012, I was employed by the Commission as a policy advisor to one of the five Commissioners. As policy advisor, I advised my Commissioner on all cases and legal matters pending before the Commission.
 - In January 2013, I began working in my current capacity as Assistant Division Director for the Utilities Division. In my current role, I review submissions that are assigned to the Utilities Division, make policy recommendations to the Director, and supervise Staff's preparation of testimony and Staff Reports that are submitted for the Commission's consideration.

1

A.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this case?

2

My purpose is to explain why Staff supports the adoption of the proposed settlement agreement ("Agreement"). My testimony will address the settlement process and provide an overview of the Agreement's provisions.

4 5

6

7

Q. Did you participate in the settlement discussions that resulted in the Agreement?

A. Yes, I did.

8

9

Q. How is your testimony organized?

10

A. My testimony has three sections. Section I is this introduction, Section II discusses the settlement process, and Section III provides an overview of the Agreement.

12

13

11

II. SETTLEMENT PROCESS

14 15

Α.

Q. Please describe the settlement process.

16

application to increase its rates and charges with the Commission. The four parties in this

On August 22, 2014, Tonto Basin Water Co., Inc. ("Tonto Basin" or "Company") filed an

17

case are the Company, Staff, Brooke Utilities, Inc. and Tonto Creek Trail RV Park, Inc.

18

Shortly after Staff filed its direct testimony in this case, the Company expressed interest in

19

initiating settlement discussions as a potential means for resolving the disputed issues. On

2021

February 27, 2015, Staff filed a Notice of Settlement Discussions in this docket indicating that

22

the parties may enter into settlement discussion beginning March 5, 2015. On March 9, 2015,

a settlement conference was held at Staff's offices. The Agreement was a result of that

23

meeting.

24

25

Q. How would you characterize the process?

26

A. I would describe the process as transparent and productive.

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

III. **AGREEMENT**

14 Q.

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Did intervenors Brooke Utilities, Inc. and Tonto Creek Trail RV Park, Inc. attend the March 9, 2015 settlement conference and participate in negotiating the Agreement?
- A. No, but they were welcomed to. Both received the notice of settlement discussions that was docketed on February 27, 2015. Staff heard from and informed Brooke Utilities, Inc. of the March 9, 2015, settlement conference. Staff has not heard from Tonto Creek Trail RV Park, Inc.
- Q. Did intervenors Brooke Utilities, Inc. and Tonto Creek Trail RV Park, Inc. receive a copy of the Agreement and have an opportunity to sign on to it?
- Yes, and Staff is not aware that either of the intervenors oppose the Agreement. However, Α. neither party has signed the Agreement to date.

Please provide a quick overview of the disputed issues resolved in the Agreement.

- The settlement negotiations largely involved three categories of disputed issues: revenue A. requirement, Staff's engineering recommendations, and a potential water hauling tariff for Tonto Basin's Roosevelt Lake Estates system.
- Please describe Sections 1, 8 and 9 of the Agreement. Q.
- These are boilerplate provisions that Staff routinely includes in the settlement agreements A. into which it enters. Section 1 contains the recitals of the Agreement and establishes the predicate circumstances. Section 8 sets forth the procedure for the Commission's eventual adoption, modification or rejection of the Agreement, as well as the parties' rights and responsibilities therefrom. Section 9 contains standard miscellaneous provisions.

Q. Please describe Sections 2, 3 and 4 of the Agreement.

A. These Sections are the backbone of the Agreement. Section 4 establishes a 10 percent cost of equity and rate of return for Tonto Basin. Tonto Basin's capital structure is comprised of 100 percent common equity. Section 2 establishes the Company's fair value rate base at \$610,490, operating expenses at \$445,942, and revenue requirement at \$506,991. These figures result in an annual rate increase of \$199,816, or 65.05 percent, and provide operating income equal to \$61,049. Section 3 adopts Staff's proposed rate design, which would result in a 61.56 percent rate increase for a 5/8" x 3/4" meter residential customer with average usage of 5,598 gallons of \$15.96, from \$25.92 to \$41.88, and a 59.15 percent rate increase for a 5/8" x 3/4" meter residential customer with median usage of 3,205 gallons of \$12.40, from \$20.97 to \$33.37.

Q. Please describe Section 5.

A. Section 5 addresses Staff's engineering recommendations. In Section 5.1, Tonto Basin agrees to complete painting its storage and pressure tanks (in the priority order identified by Staff) within 12 months of when the new rates go into effect. In Section 5.2, Tonto Basin agrees to seek an ADEQ inspection of its North Bay Estates water system and the adequacy of Tonto Basin's storage capacity and implement any recommendations made by ADEQ. Finally, in Section 5.3, Tonto Basin agrees to implement five best management practices ("BMPs") in its Cactus Forest system, which is located in an Active Management Area, and three BMPs for its other water systems, which are outside of any Active Management Areas.

Q. Please describe Section 6.

A. In Section 6, the signatories agree to a procedural mechanism to enable the Commission an opportunity to transfer the Certificate of Convenience and Necessity associated with the Cactus Forest system to Tonto Basin, which appears to have been inadvertently omitted from Decision No. 60972. The signatories believe that any hearing necessary to resolve the CC&N

issue could be held concurrently or in close proximity with the hearing scheduled in this case on April 20, 2015, to facilitate administrative efficiency.

In Section 7, the signatories agree to a procedural mechanism for Commission consideration

of a water hauling tariff for Tonto Basin's Roosevelt Lake Estates ("RLE") system should

Tonto Basin determine that it is necessary to propose one. Staff has not committed to

support the water hauling tariff if it is filed. Staff believes the merits of any such filing should

be weighed at the time it is filed, but that it should be processed as part of this case if it is

submitted within 6 months of a decision approving new rates being filed in this docket.

Q. Please describe Section 7.

A.

Q. Please describe Staff's understanding of the circumstances giving rise to Section 7.

On Sunday morning, February 15, 2015, Tonto Basin sent a Stage 4 water conservation notice to customers in its RLE system due to insufficient well production. Customers were instructed to avoid outside watering or washing of boats or vehicles. On Monday afternoon, February 16, 2015, Tonto Basin shut the RLE system down until 8 AM the next morning to allow the storage tank to fill. The Company made drinking water available at the local Spring Creek store. The Company hired a well driller to deepen its well, but water production from the well did not improve much. On February 21, 2015, the Company began hauling water to the RLE system. On February 23, 2015, the Company asked if Staff would support instituting a water hauling tariff for the RLE system similar to the East Verde Park water hauling tariff that was approved in Payson Water Co., Inc.'s recent rate case, Docket No. W-03514A-13-0111. Staff informed the Company that Staff would need to know more about the cause of and circumstances surrounding the water supply shortage in the RLE system before supporting a water hauling tariff.

Q. Was the Company successful in bringing a second well onto the RLE system?

Yes. On March 19, 2015, the Company informed Staff that it was successful in bringing a 1 A. 2 second well online and that the RLE system was back to normal operations. 3 4 Q. Does Staff believe adoption of the Agreement is in the public interest? 5 Yes. A. 6 7 Does this conclude your direct testimony? Q. A. Yes, it does.